

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

FALLBROOK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 January 2009, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

RECEIVED
FEB 06 2009

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
AND LAND USE

mlo 2/6

Meeting called to order at 7:40 PM by Chair Jim Russell, who led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance. 15 members were present, Michele Bain, Bill Bopf, Anne Burdick, Harry Christiansen, Eileen Delaney, Jean Dooley, Donna Gebhart, Tom Harrington, Jackie Heyneman, Ron Miller, Roy Moosa, Jim Russell, Paul Schaden, Steve Smith and Jack Wood.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Groups jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item. **Posted on the Agenda was the note:** The Draft General Plan Text for the General Plan update will be available on the Department of Planning and Land Use web site sdcounty.ca.gov/gpupdate or sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu, as of 15 November. Those interested can read it there and make any comments to the County and/or to the FCPG. NONE
2. Presentation by Mark Phelan, Cal-Trans SR-76 Project Manager, 619-688-6803
Mark.Phelan@dot.ca.gov and Allan Kosup SR-76, I-15 Corridor Director, 4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, 92110, on the Mission Road to I-15 portion of the SR-76 project. It is anticipated that the EIR/EIS for this portion of the project will be ready for comment in September 2009.
Community input. - Mr. Phelan presented Caltrans's current proposed improvements for Highway 76. He stated that the middle section (from Melrose to Mission Rd.) had an approved alignment and funding and was scheduled to begin construction by the end of 2009. Mr. Phelan outlined the Biological, agrological (?) and other environmental concerns that the improvements to the middle section would accommodate.

Next the East phase (from Mission to I-15) was discussed. The Speakers stated that there were two alignments that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would cover. One alignment would follow the current Highway 76 alignment, straightening and widening the right of way. The other alignment would cross the San Luis Rey River east of Mission and stay east of the river re-crossing to the north approximately one quarter mile west of I-15. The Speakers further noted that whichever alignment was eventually chosen, the improvements extend across the bridge at I-15 to the north bound on and off ramps. The schedule for the east phase is to have the alignment determined by late 2010 - early 2011 and go to construction late 2014 - early 2015. They stated that funds had been earmarked for both phases. They also outlined some of the design, construction and cost challenges Caltrans had already identified with the two alignments being studied for the east phase. They noted that there were several access points along the current alignment and noted that while if the current alignment was chosen all those access points would be accommodated but some might be restricted to right turn in, right turn out uses. Additionally, a median might be difficult to accommodate with all the turning movements. The primary difficulty with the south alignment was the need for two bridges and north alignment was environmental impacts to the riparian habitat.

The Speakers also noted that while the middle phase of Highway 76 was going to be a four lane road constructed on a right of way wide enough to accommodate a future six lane improvements, the east phase was scheduled to be four lane improvements on a four lane right of way. The reason for this approach was taken was because traffic studies had shown that one third of the Highway 76 traffic (west of Mission Road) turned north on Mission Road leaving a smaller traffic load for the east phase.

Next Mr. Russell outlined the importance of the EIR process and that until the EIR was put out for review there would be no specific findings that the public or Planning Group could comment on but that in the meantime Caltrans was gathering any and all issues in hopes of having a finished EIR that covers all of the valid concerns.

Mr. Russell then opened the floor for public comment. Several members of the audience spoke about their concerns with the public comment period coming to an early close on the east phase and the safety concerns with the northerly alignment. Further concerns were voiced that a median was a major need to accommodate the traffic that currently utilizes the highway and that would be best constructed on the south alignment. With the exception of two speakers the southerly alignment was favored due to the amount of residential development along and adjacent to the existing alignment.

The point was that construction of the south alignment would have (1) a minimum impact on the existing road, and (2) would allow funds to be rapidly applied (near dollars) instead of a protracted series of temporary traffic lanes which would extend the project time (far dollars), and (3) would decrease the cost. The question of possibly under grounding the utilities along the corridor was brought up, and Mr. Phelan stated that currently it was not being planned. After several other speakers noted that the southerly alignment was their recommendation and one speaker from Bonsall suggested that one traffic direction should be on the existing alignment and the other traffic direction could be on the south alignment. Public comment was closed.

Again Mr. Russell noted that the release of the EIR for comment was an important milestone that would allow for public comment on specific findings. A representative of River Watch stated that while Mr. Russell was correct, it was still important to lodge concerns prior to the EIR being released because after the EIR is released there is only a short public review period that can only be extended by legal action. At this point Mr. Russell opened discussion to the Planning Group members.

Ms. Eileen Delaney requested that the following concerns be addressed in the EIR. First, the impacts of the existing route versus the southern route during the construction phase and upon completion, in regards to traffic, noise, dirt, dust, vehicle exhaust and pollution to the surrounding homes and businesses. Additionally, impact on businesses and homes in the acquisition of right of way, loss of business revenue during construction and loss of business after completion should all be covered. Also if the existing route is chosen, approximately 50,000 residents of Fallbrook, who have limited east/west circulation, may lose an important east/west route during the 2-3 years of construction. How during construction what impact will resident and non resident vehicle traffic that normally uses 76, that will be forced to take alternate routes through other roads in Fallbrook that are already heavily strained and operate at or near an F level of service be affected. If the existing route is chosen and upon completion, how would this affect the local traffic? How would this affect the character of the community? Would the net gain in lanes only be 2? If the Southern route is chosen, would there be very limited impact to businesses? Would significantly less residents (approximate 4,000) be impacted during the construction phase and after completion? Would there be uninterrupted use of 76? If the southern route is chosen, would there be a gain of 4 lanes instead of a gain of 2 lanes (since the southern route would have 4 lanes & what is now hwy 76 could be used by local residents as a frontage road). Which route would be the safest and would also require less on/off ramps and have less friction? Ms. Delaney stated that regardless of the route chosen, she felt there should be a center median.

Mr. Bill Bopf stated that he was not comfortable with the projected traffic stated in Mr. Phelan's presentation (25,000 to 30,000 trips per day) and wanted the EIR to fully account for all the development proposed east of I-15.

Mr. Russell commented that this EIR would be a good time to study a diamond interchange at Stewart Canyon to help alleviate the Highway 76 and I-15 intersection. Mr. Harry Christiansen revisited the right of way width issue (a six lane width west of Mission four lanes east of Mission). He commented that the southerly bypass would provide a more uniform traffic capacity when the final build out of the six lane improvements west of mission are completed. Additionally the south route offered a more unencumbered route (avoiding numerous intersections), which would benefit all the through traffic on SR 76. Mr. Christiansen also felt that the southerly route could possibly be cheaper as well as faster to construct and would result the local road remaining a local road.

Mr. Tom Harrington asked if a preferred route had been determined as of yet. Mr. Phelan stated that one had not been chosen as of yet, and that until the EIR was in place one route would not be preferred over another. At this point Mr. Russell advised the audience to contact Caltrans with any comment and concern that they had and that Caltrans had been willing to appear and present their project to the Planning Group and would no doubt be willing to present to any other concerned group.

3. Committee appointments. Community input. Voting item

Mr. Russell read out the 2009 committee assignment for the Planning Group. Ms Donna Gebhart commented that several past members of the Parks and Recreation Committee were not being assigned to that group. Mr. Russell responded by reading a portion of the Board of Supervisors Policy I-1 that he felt spoke to Ms. Gebhart's concern. Mr. Christiansen motioned that the assignments be approved and the Group unanimously approved the motion.

Adjourned at 9:28 PM

Submitted by

Tom Harrington, secretary.

Cc: DPLU Nick Tartaglia

Fallbrook Chamber of Commerce